

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/811,655	03/20/2001	Takashi Shinzaki	1075.1151	9981
21171 7590 03/21/2007 STAAS & HALSEY LLP		EXAMINER		
SUITE 700			BHATTACHARYA, SAM	
1201 NEW YORK AVENUE, N.W. WASHINGTON, DC 20005			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
Wildimidio			2617	
				·
SHORTENED STATUTOR	Y PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
3 MO	NTHS	03/21/2007	PAF	ER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)			
		09/811,655	SHINZAKI, TAKASHI			
•	Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	·	Sam Bhattacharya	2617			
	The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply					
A SHO WHIC - Exter after - If NO - Failu Any r	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA assions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. Period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period v re to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing and patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from , cause the application to become ABANDONE	I. lely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status						
2a)⊠	 Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>15 December 2006</u>. This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final. Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i>, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213. 					
Dispositi	on of Claims					
 4) Claim(s) 1,52,53 and 56-59 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration. 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 1,52,53 and 56-59 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement. 						
Application Papers						
10)	The specification is objected to by the Examine The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accomplicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct The oath or declaration is objected to by the Example.	epted or b) objected to by the Idrawing(s) be held in abeyance. See tion is required if the drawing(s) is obj	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). lected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).			
Priority u	ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119					
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some color None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 						
2) Notice 3) Information	t(s) te of References Cited (PTO-892) te of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) tr No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Do 5) Notice of Informat P 6) Other:	ate			

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 1. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.
- 2. Claims 1, 52, 53 and 56-59 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hoghooghi et al. (US 5,959,260) in view of Irvin (US 6,195,568) and Muramatsu et al. (US 6,477,391).

Regarding claims 1, 52 and 53, Hoghooghi discloses a mobile phone 100 carried by an authorized user to perform electronic information processes, including a main body 102; a battery pack 106 detachably attached to the main body, the battery pack having an I/O section 112 to input information (handwriting, gestures, commands or annotations) to the battery pack from outside the mobile phone, and to output information from the battery back to the outside of the mobile phone; and an interface section 514/116, disposed on the contact surface between the battery pack and the main body, providing communications between the main body and the battery pack, wherein the battery pack and the main body operate together to allow biometric or user verification (handwriting) information of a user of the mobile phone to be input to the main body from outside the mobile phone for biometric verification purposes (by handwriting recognition engine 560) by being input to the battery pack through the I/O section and being input to the main body from the battery pack through the interface section, and to allow information to be output from the main body to outside of the mobile phone by being output from the main body to the battery pack via the interface section and being output from the battery pack to outside the mobile phone through the I/O section. The handwriting information

Art Unit: 2617

input to the main body from outside the mobile phone by being input to the battery pack provides additional functionality to the mobile phone. See FIGS. 1 and 5 and col. 4, line 18 – col. 5, line 43 and col. 6, lines 25-43.

Hoghooghi fails to disclose that the user verification function specifically verifies the indentity of an authorized user of the mobile phone based on the biometric information.

In an analogous art, Irvin discloses a mobile phone that includes a user verification function that verifies the indentity of an authorized user of the mobile phone based on a comparison of handwriting information. See FIG. 4 and col. 5, line 34 – col. 6, line 16. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the apparatus of Hoghooghi by incorporating this feature taught in Irvin for the purpose of directing appropriate subscription and billing information to the identified user.

The combination of Hoghooghi and Irvin fails to disclose that the interface section is an optical communications section which receives/transmits optical signals as the input/output signals.

In an analogous art, Muramatsu teaches the interface section is an optical communications section which receives and transmits optical signals as the input/output signals ("light guide 103" in Col. 7, line 36 to Col. 8, line 14 and Figure 11). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the apparatus of Hoghooghi and Irvin wherein the interface section is an optical communications section which receives/transmits optical signals as the input/output signals, as taught by

Art Unit: 2617

Muramatsu, in order to associate a mobile phone with external instruments in a non-contact manner.

Regarding claim 56, Hoghooghi discloses that the battery pack contains a processor 560 for utilizing the biometric information to provide the user verification function.

Regarding claim 57, Hoghooghi discloses that the battery pack contains a memory 558 for storing personal data of an authorized user of the mobile phone.

Regarding claim 58, Hoghooghi discloses that the battery pack communicates a result of the user verification function to the main body of the mobile phone. See FIG. 5.

Regarding claim 59, Hoghooghi discloses that the processor compares the personal data stored in the memory with the biometric information of a user of the mobile phone that is input into the input/output section of the battery pack, to provide the user verification function. See col. 6, lines 29-36.

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments filed 12/15/06 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Examiner respectfully disagrees with Applicant's arguments.

Examiner relies on Hoghooghi for a teaching of an interface section disposed on the contact surface between the battery pack and the main body. And Examiner relies on Muramatsu for a teaching of an interface section that is an optical communications section which receives and transmits optical signals as the input/output signals. Therefore, Examiner relies on the combination of Hoghooghi and Muramatsu, and not Muramatsu alone, for a teaching of an

Art Unit: 2617

optical communications means for optically receiving/ transmitting signals as the input/output signals, disposed on a contact surface between the battery pack and the main body.

Similarly, Examiner relies on Hoghooghi for a teaching of an interface section for transferring the input/output signals relating to the biometric information between the main body and the battery pack. And Examiner relies on Muramatsu for a teaching of an interface section that is an optical communications section which receives and transmits optical signals as the input/output signals. Therefore, Examiner relies on the combination of Hoghooghi and Muramatsu, and not Muramatsu alone, for a teaching of an optical communication means for transferring the input/output signals relating to the biometric information between the main body and the battery pack.

In response to applicant's arguments against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986).

Conclusion

4. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period

Art Unit: 2617

will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sam Bhattacharya whose telephone number is (571) 272-7917. The examiner can normally be reached on Weekdays, 9-6, with first Fridays off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, George Eng can be reached on (571) 272-7495. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

sb

SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER